UNIVERSITATEA BABEŞ-BOLYAI CLUJ-NAPOCA

FACULTATEA DE SOCIOLOGIE ŞI ASISTENȚĂ SOCIALĂ

ŞCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE SOCIOLOGIE

Study of contextual factors appearing in the educational aspirations of students with learning disability or difficulty

Abstract

Scientific coordonator:

Prof. Dr. ALBERT-LŐRINCZ ENIKŐ

PhD candidate:

KOLOZSVÁRI CSABA

Cluj-Napoca

2017

Table of contents of the dissertation

Keywords: learning disability, learning difficulty, contextual factors, educational aspirations, medical model, social model, equity

Topic and the summary of specialised literature review

In our dissertation, we undertook to examine the question of whether the selection of specific learning problems (learning disability and learning difficulty) in the Hungarian public education system – in order to enforce the criteria of equity – really contributes to the equality of opportunities at the output level. Or the assumption phrased in conflict theories prevails instead, that is, the basis of selection is always the origin, the assignment, and the selection only preserves or even amplifies the differences.

In the beginning of our dissertation (I.1, Chapter I.2), in the course of the conceptualization of "contextual factors" and the concepts of "educational aspirations", we have defined that we use the above mentioned concept in a broad sense. In our dissertation we do not use concept limitations and specifications that already exist in specialized literature; the latter concept is considered as a willingness to progress within the education system.

In section I.3 we reviewed the phenomena of learning disability and learning difficulty in accordance with special educational and legal-administrative considerations.
From this chapter we would point out that in both areas, our examined population is one of the main concepts of learning problems. At this point, in order to find a common name for the two populations examined and to separate them from mild cognitive disability not forming part of the dissertation, we introduced the generic term of *specific learning problem.* From the overview, we emphasize that students having an expert opinion on their specific learning problems do not differ from the average in terms of their general intellectual abilities, but their performance significantly lags behind the level expected based on their intelligence. In the case of learning disability, a neurological deficit and partial disability are assumed in the background, which is so significant that the acquisition of basic culture techniques and getting information through them will be remarkably impeded. In the case of learning difficulty, there is no consensus about that the milder partial disability problems or environmental causes result in learning failure. For the exact separation based on legal-administrative aspects (SEN), the professional definitions and differential diagnosis tools do not provide an adequate background.

Regarding the educational benefits there are several similarities between the opportunities offered to the two categories (exemption from evaluation, prolongation of preparation time, use of own equipment, adaptation of the oral / written form of the exam to the problem and the ordered additional educational services). However, in higher education, the benefits are only available for the learning disability category. Students in the learning difficulty category can no longer take advantage of the benefits that could be used in higher education.

In section II before the interpretation of the phenomenon of specific learning problems based on sociological aspects, we first found that it is sensible to assume that the concept of stigma associated with disabilities may be relevant in this specific case as well. Then we briefly reviewed the social models of disabilities and found that even in the case of learning disabilities the medical model – according to other authors' concepts, the objectivist ("in the head perspective") approach is popular. However, it would be especially obvious and practical to study the learning disability based on the social model, because by focusing on the environmental factors, especially the educational conditions, we could use our resources for normalization, not stigmatization. Then the sociological, contextual explanations of the spread of the category of learning disability in public education have been considered. Interactional explanations examine the interests of different groups in the background of the spread of learning disability. The most important identified groups are classmates, teachers, the parents of students having problems classified as learning disabilities, and professionals who are considerably interested. The institutional theories interpret the administrative category of learning disability as the responsibility of public education systems. Instead of admitting that their present operation does not make them suitable for the proper teaching of each student, the education systems assign the problem to the students, labelling them problematic, disabled. Structural theories think on the basis of social subsystems and organizations and in general they consider special education and specifically learning disability as a means of maintaining social inequalities. As an option the category can have a social function by choosing and designating a group of future "uncompetitive" ones for the labor market, but the other possibility is to outline the opposite. Accordingly, the learning disability category can also be used to pass on the social benefits of families with advantaged social class background.

We wanted to know more about the likelihood of the operation of potential explanations, so in section III we looked at the different interpretations of inequalities and

their specificities studied in the education system, by the relevant literature in accordance with social mobility. We found that selection and as a consequence segregation are considered by some authors to be sufficient to maintain or even enhance social inequalities (segregation model). We also saw that there are strong ambitions for creating a fair educational environment for all (through active actions), but the declared purpose of the actions and its observable effects are not necessarily in accord with each other.

Finally, we outlined three professional and educational policy models recognizable in the actions grouped to tackle educational inequalities, and we looked for similarities between each model. We found that the administrative model based on diagnostic categories in Hungary is in accord with the medical model presented in section II and with the deficit model presented in section III.

Based on all this information we find it questionable whether the subsystem of public education dealing with specific learning problems creates real chances of access to resources for the students. It seems to be more likely that the administrative categories and related actions contribute to the maintenance of social inequalities. In section IV of the thesis we outlined the more important conclusions of the literature review.

Objectives, hypotheses and conditions of the research

Section V covers the purpose, hypotheses, sample, method and results of the research that forms the empirical part of the dissertation. Below is a brief description of the content of this section.

The objectives of the thesis are summarized in the following points:

- To gather empirical knowledge, based on socio-demographic aspects, about the group of students whose specific learning problems are proven by experts;

- To examine the correlations between the revealed features and the classical aspects of educational inequalities;

- to analyse the quantitative indicators of equity actions as an independent variable and ideas about the progress within the education system as an indicator of vertical social mobility, how individual elements of the diagnosis-based Hungarian system affect the population under study

The focus of the thesis is primarily the "horizontal space" in which the aspiration of the students under study is born, the social medium into which the aspiration is embedded. Three

factors are highlighted in this field, the interactions of which we also want to model: family effects and school environmental impacts have been included in the dissertation as a crucial aspect on the basis of the specialised literature; As a third aspect, we should place the equity actions into the center of the study as a specific factor, appearing only in the case of students being in the category of getting benefits, that are assumed to have effects on further education. We consider the educational progress as the main point, but we also present descriptive, interpretative, situation analysis results in the rest of the thesis.

Prior to formulating the hypotheses, we highlighted the premises that are explained in detail in the literary part, because they appear implicitly in the background of our assumptions:
- The characteristic of the Hungarian school system is that it strongly selects students based on family and ethnic background. This is the case for all students, so it is assumed that this is the case also for the population we are examining.

- - In the diagnosis-oriented Hungarian special education system, we assume the stronger impact of the medical approach of disabilities than the social model.
  - According to the medical approach of disabilities, specific learning problems in the school system are considered to be the specificity of the individual (educational methods are considered to be objectively given).
- - The concepts of learning disability and learning difficulty, as regards school performance, are linked to the individual as a discrediting characteristic of stigma.
  - The educational aspirations are sensitive indicators of feedbacks that derive from family and school environment and are related to learning ability.

Our hypotheses have been formulated as follows:

H1.1 – Students from families with low socio-cultural status are overrepresented among those who have an expert opinion on specific learning problems;

H1.2 – On the basis of socio-cultural background, students with learning disabilities and learning difficulties show more similarities to each other than with the control group;

H2.1 – In the case of students with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem, there is a strong correlation between the educational achievement (certificate average) and the qualification of the parents;

H2.2. – Behind the educational achievement of students with an expert opinion on specific learning problems, more home learning can be detected than in the case of the students in the control group;

H2.3. – In the case of the groups with expert opinions on specific learning problems, we find less positive attitudes towards school and learning than in the control group.

H2.4. – The students' educational performance increases in proportion to the amount of equity actions used;

H3.1 – Students with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem typically designate a type of school (vocational school, vocational secondary school) that offers less mobility opportunities and they plan to spend shorter study time within the education system than the students in the control group.

H3.2 – Based on educational progress plans, students with learning disabilities and learning difficulties show more similarity to each other than to the control group;

The data required to examine our hypotheses was obtained by using a self-filled questionnaire prepared in paper-pencil variants. Considering our goals and capabilities, we have chosen this method of collecting data for reasons explained below.
We could not undertake to examine the structural issues of the population, relying on data from a small number of data providers, so in a short time and economically we could reach statistically analyzable amounts of data from a relatively large number of data providers.
As schools provide information on their students' data related to their expert opinion in accordance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act, the ethical / safe organization of personal meetings with data providers has been a problematic issue.

When choosing the method, it was against the use of the questionnaire that writing is an explicit weakness of the population we examined, so it was sensible to assume that they would not be too motivated in answering (a question related to this was also included in the questionnaire). We have attempted to eliminate this risk by providing questionnaire administrators with the opportunity to help with the student's difficulties in interpreting the text. At the same time, the presence of a teacher might have led to some distortions in the answers related to certain teachers and schools. When formulating the questions, we strove for avoiding complex sentences and make answering the questions as easy as possible. The operability of completion of the questionnaire was verified by a bench test in the 2015

academic year and we asked detailed feedbacks from the interviewers about the duration and process of filling. These feedbacks revealed that the questionnaire could be answered within 25 minutes on average and respondents with learning difficulties only sometimes requested explanation / interpretation from the interviewers.

Regarding the group of questions and specific questions in the questionnaire, we were inspired by the questionnaires published in the topics we discussed, but we have compiled our own measuring tool according to our goals. In the compilation of our measuring instrument, we have taken the most from the questionnaire measuring the family background variables used in the National Competence Measurement (OKM Student Questionnaire - 2016), from Lannert's (2004) questionnaires used in her research on career aspirations, and the School Success Profile as a conceptual framework meant a lot to us (Roth et al. 2010).

In our questionnaire, a total of 44 key questions were included in the following system: demographic variables; family background variables; variables related to school and learning environments; variables related to further education.

In the North Hungarian statistical region (Heves, Nógrád and Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén counties), we considered the students of grades 7-12, with expert opinion on learning disability and learning difficulty, the basic population of the research. From the national statistical reports, we found out that in 12 school grades in the three counties of Northern Hungary there are 9563 (2015 data) students with with adaptation, learning and behavioural difficulties and 2670 students with learning disabilities (2015 data), a total of 12 233 students (source: Edumap, KIR). Since there is no available data on the students' disaggregation in terms of learning disability and difficulty, the total population corresponding to our criteria is estimated to be around / no more than 5-6,000. This basic population is found in all schools of the region, in varying numbers, scattered.

The most important demographic characteristics for the whole sample - gender, residency, type of settlement, grade, type of school - are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: Composition of the sample according to the gender of respondents, type of settlement, type of school, grade and category of care (%) N = 531

Variable	**Attribute**	**person**	**%**
Gender ratio in the samples	girl	254	48%
	boy	275	52%
Distribution of domicile by type of settlement in the sample	village/parish	271	51,2%
	town	192	36,2%
	county centre	67	12,6%
Distribution by school type in the sample	primary school	314	59,1%
	vocational school	40	7,5%
	secondary school	102	19,2%
	grammar school	75	14,1%
Distribution by grade in the sample	grade 7	195	36,9%
	grade 8	122	23,1%
	grade 9	83	15,7%
	grade 10	38	7,2%
	grade 11	56	10,6%
	grade 12	36	6,6%
Distribution of administrative categories in the sample	learning disability	131	24,7%
	learning difficulty	185	34,8%
	control	213	40,1%

Regarding the distribution of administrative categories, we can see that in our sample, 59.5% of students have an expert opinion on learning disabilities or learning difficulties. The number and proportion of students with expert opinion in the sample allows them to be treated as a separate group (learning disability and learning difficulty) in the analyses, making comparisons with each other and the control group.

Summing up the specifics of our sample, we can say that along the demographic characteristics we can partially consider matching the sub-patterns as successful. The

distribution of the place of residence and school by type of settlement shows significant differences in the groups, as follows: in our sample the students of the control group who live and go to school in the county town and the high school students are overrepresented.

Among the members of two groups with expert opinions there are considerably more people who attend a vocational school compared to the control group. The groups of two administrative categories are well suited to each other in terms of their demographic characteristics.

From the demographic characteristics of our sample it follows that we cannot give a completely reliable point and interval estimates about how much the proportion of subgroups, opinion groups and clusters revealed by the survey is in the examined population, so we cannot tell how many students each of our findings are relevant to. At the same time, we could avoid other systematic distorting effects during the sampling and we were able to ensure that the students completing the questionnaires get involved randomly in the sample.

In the thesis, therefore, we avoid the point and interval estimations for the multitudes and concentrate on the correlation and hypothesis tests. The results of the presented correlation and hypothesis studies can be considered true for the basic population as a whole. The results of the tests are robust, so hardly distorted by the fact that we do not have enough information about the population to determine the representativity of the sample.

A comprehensive presentation and summary of the results - answering the hypotheses

In our thesis, we have presented our hypothesis-related findings grouped along the following three dimensions:

1. regarding the socio-demographic, socio-cultural characteristics of the population examined;
2. regarding the correlation between socio-demographic, socio-cultural characteristics and school effectiveness, and
3. concerning the specificities of the educational aspirations of the examined population.

In order to understand and evaluate the results related to the first dimension, we formulate our dilemma here as well that is whether our database is suitable for examining the question due to the specificity of our sample implied from quota sampling, and examining the differences between control and groups under study by county, settlement and school type.

In spite of the counter-arguments implied from the above mentioned methodological features, we decided that we should not miss the question of overrepresentation in our research.

On the one hand, we cannot do this because we consider the question crucial in the equal opportunities / equity approach of specific learning problems - and we hope that the focus of the next research will include a valid image of the current population. We decided on keeping and answering the question also because we are aware that any precise answer to the question of overrepresentation is valid only at the given time and for the given geographical area. Only continuous follow-up could provide reassuring and valid knowledge that could be taken for basis on planning the interventions.

Our results regarding hypotheses H1.1 and H1.2.:

We studied the differences between the sub-patterns along the simple and complex variables for the socio-cultural status of the family.

In terms of the financial situation, looking at the economic activity of parents by a complex indicator (there is no active earner, one or two active earners in the family), we found significant differences between the three groups.

In the learning disability group, we found twice as many students living in a family without an active earner (24% of students) than in the control group (12%) - in the learning difficulty group, the value is between the two groups' values (19%). As for the families where there is only one breadwinner, the rates are similar in the three groups. Differences in families without active earners are equated in the groups with two-earner families (learning disability = 41%, learning difficulty = 46%, control group = 55%).

As regards the number of earners, we have registered a worse situation in the administrative categories than in the control group.

As regards the number of people living in one household and the number of siblings, the differences between the examined groups are also significant. In the group of learning difficulties there are the most (4.67 people) who live in one household, followed by 4.59 in the learning disability group, and 4.27 in the control group. As regards the number of siblings, most children in the family (2.3) are in the learning disability group, 2.11 children in the learning difficulty group, and only 1.84 in the control group.

Considering the differences between the number of active earners and the number of people living in one household, fewer earners support families with more members in the administrative categories than in the control group. Of course, these data do not give

information on the absolute value of the amount that can be calculated per person in each group.

Measuring the financial situation there were variables where we did not find any significant deviations (e.g. subjective material wealth, possessed property, etc.).

With principal component analysis, we have made a complex index of all family background variables. In the two factors explaining the total variance of 55%, the original variables were grouped along economic possessions and cultural characteristics. The values of the factors thus created were projected into a scale of 100 degrees and called the *wealth background index* and the *cultural background index.* The two indices correlate with each other at $r = 0.34$ ($p < 0.0001$).

According to the wealth background index, by looking at the differences between groups, they do not reach an acceptable level of significance.

Concerning the cultural background factor (cultural background index), we found significant differences between the groups. In the index calibrated 100 degrees, the control group reached the highest score (40 points), with 35 points the learning disability group follows, and by 2 points behind them, the learning difficulty group reached the lowest level with 33 points.

By dividing the complex variable into its components, in the case of the variable estimating the size of family library, the differences between the groups were most significant, and also significant differences were found in our complex variables measuring the educational level of parents.

The summary of the variables regarding family factors, which show significant differences between the groups and a detailed description of the differences are summarized in the table below.

Table 1: Summary of the results regarding family background

Variable	learning disability (value)	learning difficulty (value)	control group (value)	significance level of difference
Economic activity of parents:				
- no active earner	24%	19%	12%	
- one active earner	35%	35%	33%	p<0,03
- two active earners	41%	46%	55%	
Number of people living in one household	4,59 person	4,67 person	4,27 person	p<0,005
Number of siblings	2,3 person	2,11 person	1,84 person	p<0,02
Qualification of parents:				
- no one with high school diploma	52%	50%	39%	
- one or more people with high school diploma	28%	30%	42%	p<0,04
- someone with a college or university degree	20%	20%	19%	
Number of books:				
- 0-50 books	38%	42%	27%	
- 50-150 books	25%	29%	30%	
- 150-300 books	19%	14%	20%	p<0,008
- 300-600 books	8%	10%	12%	
- 600+ books	10%	5%	11%	
Cultural background index:	35 points	33 points	40 points	p<0,01

Grouping and summarizing the results according to our hypothesis H1.1. (Students from families with low socio-cultural backgrounds are overrepresented among those who have an expert opinion on the specific learning problem):

Students with an expert opinion on learning disabilities live in larger families than the control group and typically have more siblings than those in the other two groups. Among them there is the highest proportion of the parents who do not have high school diploma or are not active in the labor market.

With regard to books in their homes, they lag behind the control group's values, but they outrun the students with expert opinion on learning difficulties.

The values of the cultural background index we count on confirm these differences.

Students with an expert opinion on learning difficulties live in families with the highest number of members.

Regarding the proportion of families without active earners, in the learning difficulty group we found the situation 5% better than in the learning disability group, but 7% worse in the

control group. Half of the students live in families where no parent has high school diploma, compared to 39% in the control group. This rate is only two percent lower than in the case of the learning disability group.
In this group, 42% of students live in families with fewer than 50 books in the home library, compared to 27% for the control group. In this group the value of the cultural background index is the lowest (7 points lower than in the control group and 2 points lower than the value measured in the learning disability group)

Summarizing all of these features, we can state that students with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem can rely mostly on less significant family resources than those who are not included in the care category. Our hypothesis H.1.1. is certified by means of our research.

To confirm our hypothesis H.1.2. (*based on the socio-cultural background, students with learning disability and students with learning difficulty show more similarity to each other than the control group*), we use the above analysis, adding the following statement: In the overview we highlight the variables in the case of which we found differences among the examined groups. Regarding the extent of the difference between the three groups, in each case, we found a smaller difference between the two groups with expert opinions than with the control group. Based on the above data, our hypothesis H.1.2. is considered justified in our research.

The second issue to be discussed in our dissertation is how the correlation between socio-cultural characteristics and educational effectiveness changes in the case when students are classified as members of the administrative category based on their learning disability or learning difficulty. First, we looked for similarities, but naturally we also present the differences that we noticed.

The average of the previous academic certificate averages as the indicator of educational effectiveness is different in the three examined groups. In the learning disability group, the certificate average was 3.14, in the learning difficulty group it was 3.24, and in the control group 3.76 (N = 521). The difference between the groups remains significant even when filtering the effect of family background indexes.
According to the parents' qualification, there is still a significant difference between the group's certificate average if we filter out the impact of the wealth background index. The interaction of the expertise group * the parents' qualification is also significant, which is

manifested the way that in the control group in the case of graduate parents the educational achievement of the child is higher (0,2 grade) compared to the children of parents with high school diploma. However, in the case of students of the care categories we can notice decrease (0.1 grade in the learning disability group, 0.3 grade in the learning difficulty group).

To our hypothesis H2.1 according to which there is a strong correlation between the educational achievement (certificate average) and the qualification of the parents in the case of groups with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem; we have found the answer through statistical tools: the correlation can be detected. However, we note that the correlation is less close than in the control group.

In connection with the verification of our hypothesis, an interesting observation was also made in our study: the children of graduated parents in the administrative category have weaker educational achievement than the children of the parents with high school diploma in the care category. There is no explanation for this phenomenon, additional qualitative data would be needed to understand it.

According to our Second Hypothesis on School Effectiveness (H2.2.), *behind the educational achievements of students with expert opinion on specific learning problems more home-learning can be detected than in the case of students in the control group.*

The survey of our discrepancy hypothesis is in the background of our assumption. Do the students in the administrative category make more efforts to achieve the same academic performance as their peers who are not included in the administrative category?

As we have seen above, the certificates averaged in the groups are different, so we first checked the fact and the extent of the time spent with home learning -certificate average correlation. We have found that time spent on homework is strongly but not correlated with the certificate average of the previous academic year. The coexistence of certificate and the time spent on the homework assignment was still significant even if the effect of the cultural background was filtered from the context.

Considering the opinion of the expert groups we did not find any significant differences, so the students with expert opinion spend as much time doing their homework as the members of the control group. This did not change if we filtered out the impact of the cultural background index from the contextual system.

We could not justify our hypothesis H2.2. In our sample, students in the administrative category spend the same amount of time learning at home as their peers in the care category.

Our hypothesis H2.3. (*In the case of groups with expert opinions on specific learning problems we find less positive attitudes towards school and learning than in the case of the control group*), formulated the differences between the students with an expert opinion and the ones who do not have it.

Of the 18 statements revealing the relation of pupils to learning and school environment, 9 of the 18 statements found significant differences between the groups with expert opinions. In each of the items with significant differences, the group of learning disabilities considered the content of the statements to be the least true for themselves. In five cases of significant discrepancy, the control group were thinking in the most positive way. The values of the learning difficulty group were approaching sometimes the results of the control group and sometimes the results of the learning disability group.

Among the results, we would highlight the "I can easily learn the curriculum" statement, which was considered by both groups of the care categories considerably less true for themselves than by the students of the control group (learning disability = 40 points, learning difficulty = 42 points, control group = 54 points). This phenomenon can also be interpreted as an expression of the stigma, that is to say, based on the feedback from the environment, the mediated image is integrated into the self-image and self-definition of the stigmatized persons, which can determine their behavior as well(Dudley-Marling 2004, Shifrer 2013/1). In the case of the other statement about learning ("learning is important for me"), the learning disability group lag behind the other two groups with 10 and 11 points (learning disability = 54 points, learning difficulty = 64 points, control group = 65 points).

There are two outstanding results for the learning difficulty group: one is the assessment of teacher support (1 "my teachers support me to make the most of myself"), the other is the interest in the curriculum (2. "I'm mostly interested in learning"). In both cases, students in the learning difficulty group are highly positive compared to the other two groups. (1. learning disability = 66 points, learning difficulty = 73 points, control group = 67 points; 2. learning disability = 51 points, learning difficulty = 58 points, control group = 52 points).

By summarizing the results of the learning difficulty group, we find that they consider learning difficult similarly to the learning disability group, but they also see the importance of learning as the control group. Students in the learning difficulty group consider the curriculum

more interesting than the other two groups and they perceive the support of teachers more strongly.

Using regression analysis, by checking how much each item contributes to the variance of the certificate averages - that is, how much they explain the educational effectiveness - we have found that the 7 variables modeled by the algorithm explain 25 percent of the variance of the certificate averages. Among the variables, in the model the "I can easily learn the curriculum" statement has the greatest significance, which was evaluated the least positive by the students in the administrative category. This confirms our assumption that opinions on learning and schools have a significant impact on academic results.

Statements on school and learning were arranged into factors by main component-based analysis. In the case of two of the four factors thus obtained, there was a significant difference between the groups with expert opinions (the difference between the factor of the attitude towards learning and the factor of the attitude towards school and teachers is significant).

In our interpretation of the change of the factors showing difference between the groups, we found that while in the case of the factor of the attitude towards learning, both groups with expert opinions show a more negative picture than the control group, in the case of the factor of the attitude towards school and teachers, the learning difficulty group has the most positive opinion and the control group has the least positive.

Reflecting on our hypothesis H2.3. the concept must be differentiated based on the results highlighted above. Based on the results, it is considered justified that students with an expert opinion have less positive attitude towards learning than those with no expert opinion. At the same time (in the learning difficulty group), the positive impact of support from teachers appears in their attitude towards school, so their attitude towards school is more positive than the control group's.

Also in the scope of school-related issues in our hypothesis H2.4. we assumed that the students' educational performance increases in proportion to the amount of equity actions used.

This correlation was verified within the groups with expert opinions (316 persons) and it contained two groups of questions. In one of the question groups, we asked about the study benefits (exemption from evaluation of some subject, use of own equipment on exams, longer preparation time on exams, substitution of oral exams with written exams, or vice versa). In

the other question group we dealt with the use and frequency of educational supplementary services. In the research we only look at equity actions based on quantitative aspects.

With respect to certificate averages we did not find any significant difference between the two groups with two types of expert opinion. In our sample the learning disability group had 3.12, while the learning difficulty group had 3.24 certificate averages. During the analysis, it was found that the allowances used on the exams did not significantly affect the certificate averages in any of the cases, and in no case did we find any significant allowance * expert opinion group interactions either. That is, none of the four allowances on the exams affect demonstrably the certificate averages, neither in a positive nor in a negative way.

In the case of educational supplementary services, we asked for information from our respondents about whether or not they attend developmental workshops or tutoring at school or out of the school and if they do, how often (more times a week, once a week, more rarely or never).

Based on the answers, cluster analysis revealed three groups in the sample, which differed considerably in that whether they receive development (and / or tutoring) in the school, do not receive or only rarely receive development or they are typically developed outside the school as well.

We found a negative ($r = -0.21$, $p < 0.0001$) correlation between the average of the previous year's certificate and the frequency of attending out-of-school developmental workshops, so we state in our research that *the frequency of school development does not resolve the students' educational defaults.*

The same is true of the correlation between the certificate average and the tutoring at school. Here, we found highly significant, negative, poor correlation ($r = -0.14$ ($p < 0.001$). According to our results, *the frequency of school tutoring does not affect the students' educational defaults, either.*

In the case of the frequency of attending non-school developmental workshops, $r = + 0.04$ is the correlation with the certificate average, ie there is no significant linear correlation. In the case of out-of-school tutoring, the correlation is $r = +0.10$, it cannot be considered significant.

Considering the development of students based on cluster groups, we found significant differences in certificate averages. This is due to the fact that the average of the students developed in the school is 2.99, while the average of the cluster group developed outside the

school is 3.44, as well as the ones' who do not receive development. The result is, however, varied by the fact that in the analysis we also saw that the students with lower socio-cultural backgrounds are typically found in the school development cluster group, and students from a higher status family typically also get out-of-school development. Based on our results, our hypothesis H2.4. is not considered justified.

Finally, the following hypotheses were formulated in order to clarify the questions occurring in the school progress plans of the students classified in the care category.

H3.1. -*Students with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem typically designate a type of school (vocational school, vocational secondary school) that offers a lower mobility opportunity and shorter learning time within the education system than the students in the control group.*

H3.2. – *Based on the school progress plans, students with learning disability and students with learning difficulty show more similarities to each other than to the control group.*

The analyzes were also performed on the whole sample, however, the differences between the types of secondary school institutions and the separation of the three groups made the interpretation of our results difficult, so in the thesis we showed the results regarding the sample of primary schoolchildren (N = 314).
From the analyzes we made, we will review the following results to examine the above assumptions:
In the learning disability group, 44% of the students who are planning to attend vocational school, and are currently in primary school, this proportion is 37% in the learning difficulty group, and 20% in the control group. The members of the control group are planning to continue their studies in grammar school in five- six times bigger proportion than those in the administrative category (learning disability group = 6%, learning difficulty group = 7%, control group = 33%). The differences between the three groups with expert opinions cannot be accidental. However, the contrast between the two administrative categories is not significant.

Students in the administrative category choose twice more often a type of school (vocational school) which does not give high school diploma, and one fifth - sixth of the students choose a type of school (grammar school) which is the most likely to prepare for higher education, than the control group students.

In terms of planned education, respondents could choose from seven options in the questionnaire, but in the analysis, as we did for the parents, the attributes were grouped into three groups and we looked at whether or not they want to graduate from high school or plan to obtain a diploma.

We found significant differences between the groups of the administrative categories of in terms of their planned school qualification. The proportions were as follows: in the learning disability group, 61% of students do not plan to graduate from high school; In the learning difficulty group this ratio is 51% and 30% in the control group. We would like to highlight the differences of the aspirations for getting a diploma: 9% of students in the learning disability group are planning to go on higher education, 11% in the learning difficulty group, while this ratio is 28% in the control group. The contrast between the two administrative categories is not significant.
The correlation between the expert groups and the planned school qualification remains significant even if we filter out from the correlation the impact attributable to the parents' qualifications.

We also collected data on how many years of study (attending school) the examined students are planning. We wanted to use the results mainly to find out how much the previous question, that is, the planned school qualification, can be considered valid. If we do not find a positive co-existence between the two data, we could not take the qualifications seriously. In our case the correlation between the two variables is almost consequently close: $r = 0.72$.

The values of the three groups were as follows: learning disability group = 11.84 years, learning difficulty group = 12.42 years, control group = 13.21 years. The contrast between the two groups with expert opinions is not significant.
Based on the above results our hypothesis H3.1. is considered justified.

To justify our hypothesis H3.2., we use the same results, the following: we did not find any significant contrast regarding the planned average time of study of the two groups with expert opinions, as no contrast was found in the case of planned qualification and the selection of secondary school type, either.

Our hypothesis H3.2. is also considered justified.

Summing up the answers to our hypotheses, the following picture emerges about the population under study:

Students with an expert opinion on learning disability or learning difficulty typically live in families with fewer cultural resources than their peers with no expert opinion. Considering their family resources, the two groups with expert opinions show more similarities to each other than to the control group.

The classical correlation between the parent's qualification and school performance can be demonstrated in their case as well, but the correlation is not as close as in the case of the control group.

Their attitude to learning is less positive than those students' who do not have an expert opinion, but they perceive more support from teachers than their peers with no expert opinion.

Students with expert opinion do not spend more time with home learning than their peers with no expert opinion.

More students in the learning disability category are relieved of the evaluation of some subject than in the group of students with learning difficulty- the other study allowances are given to students of the two expert groups in a similar proportion.

The students with expert opinion who take advantage of the study benefits do not have better educational achievement than those who get no benefits.

The students whose family background is less favorable receive more school development/tutoring, and in their case the educational achievements are also lower than in the case of students who get out-of-school development or are not developed at all.

Students with an expert opinion demonstrably plan a shorter school career than their peers with no expert opinion. In the case of both groups with expert opinions, a more decisive factor in their choice of school is to avoid the risk of being dropped out (easy and safe admission) than to create opportunities for further education.

Conclusions formulated in the dissertation

In the section which is about the formulation of our conclusions we discussed our starting question, based on the knowledge of the results, namely whether the selection of the specific learning problem in order to validate the aspects of equity (according to the diagnosis-based model in the Hungarian education system) really contributes to equal opportunities on the level of output.

In the section of the conclusions of the dissertation, the strengths and limitations of the research were taken into account, and along the results we proposed questions worth considering for further research. Below, we describe the contents of the thesis in more detail.

The significance and originality of the thesis

The significance and importance of this essay is primarily seen in an attempt to interpret and describe a biological and / or psychological state based on the social (social) model. The approach, of course, has the history of international literature (Dudley-Marling 2004, Reid & Valle 2004, Anyon 2009), but it is far from widespread. It is thus a reference to the originality of our work that it approaches a known problem, from a rarely used perspective. The rarely used point of view also indicates that the issues raised in the thesis are largely unexplored.

The relevance of the dissertation is also supported by the social discourse that was triggered by the recent amendment of the Act on Public Education (Act LXX of 2017) concerning the benefits of BTMN students. Strong press coverage could have contributed to the release of professional positions (Position 2017) on the subject. Trilateral interest (legislator, press / publicity and profession) indicates fertile conditions for reinterpreting the issues and redesigning the interventions. Considering the contribution of this paper to the approach of specific learning problems in an adaptive educational environment, we appreciate that we managed to draw some "colors" on the white patch of the “pan-European data deficiency”.

The examination of the disadvantages of students with an expert opinion on a specific learning problem within the public education system is a poorly discussed area in the Hungarian professional literature. In our research we have created a significant and suppletory database.

In our view, our thesis provides a basis for planning and conducting further exploratory research, with the help of which a more efficient use of the resources available in the public education system will be possible.

Finally, in our dissertation, we have been able to deny such beliefs taken over in public thinking like: if the students go to developmental workshops more often, they will be more effective at school or students with learning disability make more effort at home to have better educational achievements.

The limitations of the thesis

Naturally, our thesis has several limitations. We consider taking these limitations into consideration consciously as important as the observance of strengths.

The geographical limitation of our research: we only worked from data from the region of Northern Hungary, so we can consider our results valid referring to this area. (This

geographic limitation is also considered as the strength of the research, as in this way a sharper image of the population emerged than if we give up on the control of economic geographical circumstances.)

Another deficiency of our research is that in our sample in the course of fitting of the control group to the examined groups, disproportions can be observed according to type of settlement and school. We treated this feature of our sample as a fact and being aware that these are significant inequality dimensions, we tried to take them into account in the interpretation of the results.

Because of our limited resources, we worked with a single measuring tool and questionnaire, so we could not undertake to do a deeper, qualitative analysis.

The questionnaire is not an optimal tool in every respect for addressing students with reading and writing problems, and the validity of data collected is questionable. We tried to rectify the detected barrier by sample size and statistical analysis.

Suggestions for using the results of the thesis

As stated above, we have taken steps to get acquainted with an unexplored area. The discovery, of course, cannot be considered complete, but we also consider some of the results to be highlighted that should be taken into account in educational policy decisions.

The fact that students classified in the administrative category due to specific learning problems have fewer family resources than their peers not included in an administrative category can be used in the differential diagnosis area. It focuses on the frequently underscored part of diagnostic work that is directed towards the examination of environmental factors. Based on our results, it is necessary to apply more reliable measuring tools to examine the social background.

In our research, we proved that the frequency of development at school does not resolve the student's lack of success. While interpreting this result, we have found that the school also seeks to compensate for the disadvantages appearing in the family background with development. Our suggestion deriving from the result is that we consider it worthwhile to differentiate between the problems and the educational policy responses provided. In other words, to tackle social problems, we should not expect an efficient solution from the development of students, but also social policy tools need be available.

The differences between the groups were investigated longer in the field of further education and we found that in the case of similar school performance, students with

expert opinions plan a shorter school career than the control group's students, in choosing their secondary school, to avoid the risk of being dropped out is a more important factor than to create the opportunity of further education after secondary school.

In the framework of our thinking this result is explained by the previous facts (less family resources, study benefits and educational supplementary services not shown in the educational achievements, more negative attitude to learning). Using the conceptual framework of the medical model, it might also be possible to explain the shorter school career as a result of a negative difference in the cognitive ability profile of the examined population.

Regardless of the explanations, the negative differences found in the planned level of further education - the early closure - are a major loss from the point of view of the labor market. By means of further research it would be worth comparing the key skills in school success and the labor market competence list.

In our thesis we did not discard the medical model explanation, but it was complemented by the fact that not only the ability but the environmental differences also play a role in the categorization into the administrative category, and the categorization itself, also functioning as an environmental factor, affects the students' educational aspirations.

In our dissertation, we undertook to focus on the contextual factors affecting the school progression of students classified in the administrative category due to specific learning problems. Theoretically, it is possible and expedient to supplement the medical approach of learning disability and especially learning difficulty concepts based on the social model approach. Based on the results of our research, we supported our theoretical idea with empirical arguments.

Irodalomjegyzék

1. Albert-Lőrincz E. (2012) – A gyermekek társadalmi beilleszkedési nehézségeinek háttértényezői és a közösségi megelőzés megtervezése; in: Erdélyi Társadalom – 10. évf. 1. sz., pp. 23 - 37

2. Anastasiou D., Kauffmann J. M. (2011) - A Social Constructionist Approach to Disability: Implications for Special Education; in: Exceptional Children; Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 367-384
3. Állásfoglalás 2014 - *Nevelési Tanácsadók Országos Egyesülete* - Javasolt szempontrendszer a diagnosztikus protokollhoz – http://www.nevtanegy.hu *(utolsó letöltés 2016.12.20)*
4. Állásfoglalás (2017) – Állásfoglalás a beilleszkedési, tanulási és magatartási nehézségeket (BTMN) mutató gyermekeket érintő törvénymódosításról; MLSzSz, ELTE, BGGyK Logopédiai Szakcsoportja http://www.barczi.elte.hu/media/21/8d/1fe832d373ce2c84c1986a0e3986b2c44cb10ce3cfa8a7859eefe9df24e0/%C3%81LL%C3%81SFOGLAL%C3%81S_MLSZSZ_ELTEBGGYKLOGO.pdf (letöltve 2017. június 27.)
5. Andor M., Liskó I. (1999) – Iskolaválasztás és mobilitás; Budapest, Iskolakultúra
6. Anyon, Y. (2009) – Sociological Theories of Learning Disabilities: Understanding Racial Disproportionality in Special Education – Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 19: 1, 44-57
7. Artiles A. J. (2006) – A gyógypedagógia változó identitása – Paradoxonok és dilemmák a kultúra és a tér nézőpontjából; in: Iskolakultúra, 10. sz. pp. 3 – 35
8. Artiles A. J., King Thorius K., Bal A., Neal R., Waitoller F. R., Hernandez D. (2011) - Beyond Culture as Group Traits: Future Learning Disabilities Ontology, Epistemology, and Inquiry on Research Knowledge Use; Learning Disability Quarterly; 34(3) 167-179
9. Babbie, E. (2001) – A társadalomtudományi kutatás gyakorlata; Balassi Kiadó, Budapest
10. Bánfalvy Cs. (2003) – Gyógypedagógiai szociológia; Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Bárczi Gusztáv Gyógypedagógiai Főiskolai Kar, Budapest
11. Bánfalvy Cs. (2009) – A fogyatékos emberek iskolai integrációjáról (A magyarországi integrációs folyamat és helyzet); Esély, 2009. 2. sz., pp. 3-16
12. Bánfalvy Cs. (2014) – Fogyatékos személyek diplomával; in: Gyógypedagógiai Szemle, 42. évf. 4. sz. pp. 249 – 267
13. Berényi E. (2008) – Problémák és „problémás gyerekek” az iskolában: mi van a kategóriák mögött?; in: Erőss G., Kende A. (szerk.) Túl a szegregáción: Kategóriák burjánzása a közoktatásban; L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest; pp. 235 - 258

14. Berger P. L., Luckmann T. (1998) – A valóság társadalmi felépítése – Tudásszociológiai értekezés; Jószöveg Műhely Kiadó, Budapest
15. Bernáth G. – Kereszty Zs. – dr. Perlusz A. – Szórádi I. – dr. Torda Á. (2008) - Roma ≠ hátrányos helyzetű ≠ tanulási nehézséggel küzdő ≠ tanulási zavaros ≠ enyhe fokú értelmi fogyatékos; in: Esélyegyenlőség – deszegregáció – integráló pedagógia - Egy stratégia elemei; Educatio, Budapest
16. Bernstein, B. (1996) – Nyelvi szocializáció és oktathatóság. In Meleg Cs. (szerk.), Iskola és Társadalom I. Szöveggyűjtemény (pp. 130-149). Pécs: JPTE Tanárképző Intézet Pedagógia Tanszék.
17. Blaskó Zs. (2002) Kulturális reprodukció, vagy kulturális mobilitás? Budapest, Szociológiai Szemle, 2002/2.sz. pp. 3 - 27
18. Blaskó Zs. (2008) – Származási hatások a munkaerőpiacon? A társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek iskolarendszeren kívüli átörökítéséről; Ph.d értekezés; Corvinus Egyetem, Budapest
19. Blau, P. M. (1999) – Egyenlőtlenség és heterogenitás; In.: Angelusz Róbert (szerk.) A társadalmi rétegződés komponensei; Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, Budapest. 359-382
20. Bolla V. (2012) - A tanulási zavarral küzdő gyermekek megküzdési stratégiái; Doktori értekezés, Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Pécs
21. Bourdieu, P. (2002/1) – Gazdasági tőke, kulturális tőke, társadalmi tőke; in: Felkai G. – Némedi D. – Somlai P. (szerk): Szociológiai irányzatok a XX. században; Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, Budapest; pp. 431 – 445
22. Bourdieu, P. (2002/2) – A mezők logikája; in: Felkai G. – Némedi D. – Somlai P. (szerk): Szociológiai irányzatok a XX. században; Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, Budapest; pp. 418 – 430
23. Bowen, G. L. – Richman J. M. (2010) – The School Success Profile: Assessing the Social Enviorment and the Individual Adaptation of Middle and Highschool Students; In: Sociologia 2010/1; Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai, Kolozsvár
24. Bozick R., Alexander K., Entwisle D., Dauber S., Kerr K. (2010) - Framing the Future: Revisiting the Place of Educational Expectations in Status Attainment; Social Forces, Vol. 88, No. 5 (July 2010), pp. 2027-2052
25. Callinan S., Cunningham E., Theiler S. (2013) – Revisiting Discrepancy Theory in Learning Disabilities: What Went Wrong

and Why We Should Go Back; in: Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling; Vol. 23. No. 1. pp. 1 – 17

26. Carrier, J. G. (1986) – Learning disability: Social Class and the Construction of Inequality in American Education; Westport, Greenwood Press, Inc.

27. Colker, R. (2011) – The Learning Disability Mess; in: Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law Vol. 20 No.1; pp. 81 - 106

28. Coleman, J. S. (2000) – Társadalomelmélet, társadalomkutatás, cselekvéselmélet. In Felkai G., Némedi D. & Somlai P. (szerk.), *Szociológiai irányzatok a XX. században;* pp. 191-215; Új Mandátum Kiadó, Budapest.

29. Connor D. J., Gallagher D., Ferri B. A. (2011) – Broadening our Horizons: Toward a Plurality of Methodologies in Learning Disability Research; Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 34, No. 2, Valuing a Plurality of Research Methodologies in the Field of LD: Issue I of II (Spring 2011), pp. 107-121

30. Christensen, C. A., Gerber, M. M., Everhart, R. B. (1986) – Toward a Sociological Perspective on Learning Disabilities; Educational Theory, 36 (4), pp. 317–331.

31. Cs. Czachesz E., Radó P. (2003) - Oktatási egyenlőtlenségek és speciális igények; in: Halász G. és Lannert J. (szerk.) Jelentés a magyar közoktatásról 2003, Országos Közoktatási Intézet, Budapest, pp. 349-377

32. Csata Zs. (2004) – Iskolázottsági esélyegyenlőtlenségek az erdélyi magyar fiatalok körében; Erdélyi Társadalom – 2. évf. 2. sz. 99. – 132.

33. Csányi Y. (2013) – Integráció/inklúzió és a szakvéleményezés összefüggései; in: Gyógypedagógiai Szemle; 2013/3. sz. pp. 165. – 173.

34. Csépe V. (2008) - A különleges oktatást, nevelést és rehabilitációs célú fejlesztést igénylő (SNI) gyermekek ellátásának gyakorlata és a szükséges teendők; in Fazekas K., Köllő J., Varga J. (szerk.) – Zöld könyv a magyar közoktatás megújításáért; ECOSTAT, Budapest, pp.: 139.-166.

35. Czövek A. (é.n.) - Szociálpolitikai rendszerek és ellátások; Kézirat

36. Czövek A. - Fazakas I. - Kolozsvári Cs (2012). – Gyermekek az iskolában, in: Életképek az iskolapszichológia gyakorlatából, szerk. Csibi M, Csibi S., Ábel Kiadó, Kolozsvár

37. Davis, K. és Moore, W. E. (2010): A rétegződés néhány elve. In: Angelusz – Éber – Gecser (szerk.): Társadalmi rétegződés olvasókönyv, TÁMOP 2010-201, 50–63.

38. Daviso, A. V., Denney, S. C., Baer, R. M., Flexer, R. (2011) – Postschool Goals and Transition Services for Students With Learning Disabilities; in: American Secondary Education, Vol. 39 No. 2; pp. 77-93
39. Dékány J. – Mohai K. (2012) – Egyéb pszichés fejlődési zavarral küzdő gyermekek, tanulók komplex vizsgálatának diagnosztikus protokollja – Specifikus tanulási zavarok (írott nyelvhasználat zavarai, diszkalkulia) - Educatio Társadalmi Szolgáltató Nonprofit Kft, Budapest
40. Dudley-Marling, C. (2004) - The Social Construction of Learning Disabilities – Journal of Learning Disabilities 37: 6, pp. 482–489
41. Dudley-Marling, C., Dippo, D. (1995) – What Learning Disability Does: Sustaining the Ideology of Schooling; Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28 (7), pp. 408–414
42. EDUMAP-http://edumap.ofi.hu/hu/?id=0109de37981b56c6d18883e5b2ac7342/2014/map
43. Erőss G., Kende A. (2009) – All against misdiagnosis – Sociologists, neurologists, economists, psychologists and special educators for inclusion; Final Report „Hungarian Health"; Knowledge and Policy in education and health sector; http://www.knowandpol.eu/IMG/pdf/hunhealth_ori2-pa1_final_final.pdf (utolsó letöltés: 2017. július 10.)
44. Erőss G., Kende A. (2010) –Sajátos nevelési igény: közpolitikák, tudományok, gyakorlatok. Educatio 4. sz. 625.–636.
45. Fehérvári A. (2013) – Szakiskolások rekrutációja; in: Educatio 4. sz. 516.–528.
46. Fejes J. B., Szenczi B. (2010) – Tanulási korlátok a magyar és az amerikai szakirodalomban; in: Gyógypedagógiai Szemle, 38. évf. 4. sz., pp. 273 – 287
47. Fényes, H., Pusztai, G. (2004). A kulturális és a társadalmi tőke kontextuális hatásai az iskolában. Statisztikai Szemle, 82(6-7), 567–582.
48. Gaál É. (2000) – A tanulásban akadályozott gyermekek az óvodában és az iskolában In: Illyés S. (szerk.) Gyógypedagógiai alapismeretek. BGGYTF, Budapest, 429–460
49. Gelb, S. A., & Mizokawa, D. T. (1986). Special Education and Social Structure: The Commonality of ''Exceptionality.'' American Educational Research Journal, 23(4), 543–557.
50. Gerebenné Várbíró K. (1995) – A tanulási zavar jelenségkörének gyógypedagógiai pszichológiai értelmezése. In Zászkaliczky P. (szerk.): „...önmagában véve senki sem..." Tanulmányok a gyógypedagógiai pszichológia és határtudományainak köréből;ELTE, BGGYFK Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 216–245

51. Gallagher D. (2010) - Hiding in Plain Sight: The Nature and Role of Theory in Learning Disability Labeling; in Disability Studies Quarterly, vol. 30, No. 2. http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1231/1278 (utolsó letöltés: 2017. július 10.)
52. Goffman, E. (1981) – A hétköznapi élet szociálpszichológiája. Budapest: Gondolat Könyvkiadó
53. Goffman, E. (1998) – Stigma és szociális identitás; In.: Megismerés, előítélet, identitás – Szociálpszichológiai szöveggyűjtemény (Erős F. szerk.) Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola- Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, Budapest, pp. 263-291.
54. Goldthorpe J. H. (2007) - "Cultural Capital": Some Critical Observations; Sociologica, 2007/2;
55. Gordosné Szabó A. (2004) – Bevezető általános gyógypedagógiai ismeretek – Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest
56. Gottfredson, L. S. (2002) – Gottfredson's Theory of Circumscription, Compromise and Self-Creation; In: Brown (Ed.) Career Choice and Development, Jossey-Bass, San-Francisco, pp. 85-148
57. Gyarmathy É. (1998) – Tanulási zavarok szindróma a szakirodalomban; in: Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 48. évf. 10. sz. pp. 59 – 68
58. Halász G. (2001) – Az oktatási rendszer; Műszaki Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
59. Halász G. (2004) – A sajátos nevelési igényű gyermekek oktatása: európai politikák és hazai kihívások; in: Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 54. évf. 2. sz. pp. 28-37
60. Halász G., Annási F. (2011) – Az oktatási rendszerek elméleti alapjai; Szegedi Tudományegyetem Közoktatási Vezetőképző Intézet
61. Haller, A. O. (1968) – On the Concept of Aspiration; Rural Sociology, 33(4), 483-487.
62. Horng, S. C. (2009) - Learning Disabilities as a Non-negative Ontology: Mental Hygiene, Medicalization and Education; in: SFU Educational Review, Volume 1 (2009), pp 58-67.
63. Hradil S. (2010) - Társadalmi helyzetek és miliők: egy fejlett társadalom struktúrájának elemzése; in: Angelusz R., Éber M., Gecser O. (szerk.) Társadalmi rétegződés olvasókönyv; TÁMOP 2010-201; pp. 396 – 427
64. Huszár Á. (2011) - Társadalmi rétegződés és az egyenlőtlenségek igazolása Sérülékeny csoportok a magyar társadalomban; Szociológiai Szemle, 21. évf. 3. sz. 107–124.

65. ISCED (1997) - International Standard Classification of Education; UNESCO; http://www.unesco.org/education/information/nfsunesco/doc/isced_1997.htm(utolsó letöltés: 2017. július 10.)
66. ISCED (2011) - International Standard Classification of Education; UNESCO; http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/DOcuments/isced-2011-en.pdf (utolsó letöltés: 2017. július 10.)
67. Kálmán Zs., Könczei Gy. (2002). A Taigetosztól az esélyegyenlőségig. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
68. Kavale, K. A. – Spaulding, L. S. – Beam, A. P. (2009) – A Time to Define: Making the Specific Learning Disability Definition Prescribe Specific Learning Disability; Lerning Disability Quaterly, vol. 32. pp. 39-48
69. Keller J., Mártonfi Gy. (2006) – Oktatási egyenlőtlenségek és speciális igények; in Halász G. és Lannert J. (szerk.) Jelentés a magyar közoktatásról 2006; Országos Közoktatási Intézet, Budapest, pp. 377-411
70. Kertesi G., Kézdi G. (2008) – Az oktatási szegregáció okai, következményei és ára; in: Esélyegyenlőség – deszegregáció – integráló pedagógia - Egy stratégia elemei; Educatio, Budapest
71. Kovács I. V. (2004) – Esélyteremtés hátrányban; Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 54. évf. 1. sz. pp. 3 – 11.
72. Könczei Gy., Hernádi I. (2011) – A fogyatékosságtudomány főfogalma és annak változásai. Hipotetikus kísérlet rekonstrukcióra; In Nagy Z. É. (szerk.) Az akadályozott és egészségkárosodott emberek élethelyzete Magyarországon; Nemzeti Család- és Szociálpolitikai Intézet, Budapest; pp 7 – 28
73. Lannert J. (2004) – Pályaválasztási aspirációk (A 13 és 17 évesek továbbtanulási aspirációi mögött munkáló tényezők három kistérségben) – PhD értekezés, Budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem
74. Lannert, J. (2009) – A továbbtanulási aspirációk társadalmi meghatározottsága. Online forrás: http://ofi.hu/tovabbtanulasi-aspiraciok-tarsadalmi-meghatarozottsaga (utolsó letöltés: 2017. július 10.)
75. Lányiné Engelmayer Á. (2014) - Változásban a pszichológiai és gyógypedagógiai diagnosztika - Neveléstudomány 2014/3; 33-52
76. Mesterházi Zs. (1995) – A tanulási képességről és a tanulási akadályozottságról; in: Gyógypedagógiai Szemle, 23. évf. 1. sz. pp. 12 - 33

77. Mesterházi Zs. (2006) - Változik-e a gyógypedagógia identitása? Iskolakultúra, 6–7. sz.; pp. 150–163.
78. *Nahalka I. (2002)* - Hogyan alakul ki a tudás a gyerekekben? – Konstruktivizmus és Pedagógia; Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest
79. *Nahalka I. (2003) – Az oktatás társadalmi meghatározottsága; in: Falus Iván (szerk.) Didaktika – elméleti alapok a tanítás tanulásához; Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 23-37*
80. *Nahalka I. (2010) – Az iskolarendszer esélyegyenlőtlenségeket kezelő folyamatai a PISA 2006 felmérés tükrében; in: Új Pedagógiai Szemle 60. évf. 2-3 sz. 3-27*
81. *Nahalka I. – Zempléni A. (2014) – Hogyan hat az iskola/osztály tanulóinak heterogén/homogén összetétele a tanulók eredményességére; in: Csullog K., D. Molnár É., Herczeg B., Lannert J., Nahalka I., Zempléni A. - HATÁSOK ÉS KÜLÖNBSÉGEK Másodelemzések a hazai és nemzetközi tanulói képességmérések eredményei alapján, Oktatási Hivatal, Budapest*
82. OKM (2015) – Országos kompetenciamérés – Országos jelentés – Oktatási Hivatal https://www.oktatas.hu/pub_bin/dload/kozoktatas/meresek/orszmer2015/Orszagos_jelentes_2015_2kor.pdf (utolsó letöltés: 2016. június 17.)
83. OKM Tanulói kérdőív (2016) – Országos kompetenciamérés – Tanulói kérdőív – Oktatási Hivatal https://www.oktatas.hu/pub_bin/dload/kozoktatas/meresek/orszmer2016/OKM2016_Tanuloi_kerdoiv.pdf (utolsó letöltés: 2016. november 20.)
84. Orr A. C., Hamming S. B. (2009) - Inclusive Postsecondary Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities: A Review of the Literature; in: Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 181-196
85. Porkolábné Balogh K., S. Gerencsik E. (1989) – Pedagógia-pszichológia, Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest
86. Pető I. – Endre K. (2008) – Az inklúzió és a Warnock Jelentések (1978, 2005); Iskolakultúra 5-6; pp. 112-123
87. Pusztai G. (2009). Társadalmi tőke és az iskolai pályafutás. Budapest: Új Mandátum Kiadó.
88. Radó P. (2007) - Méltányosság az oktatásban - Két jelentés az oktatás méltányosságáról, Oktatási és Kulturális Minisztérium, Budapest

89. Reid D. K., Valle J. W. (2004) - The Discursive Practice of Learning Disability: Implications for Instruction and Parent–School Relations; in: Journal of Learning Disabilities 37 (6); pp. 466 – 481
90. Róbert P. (2002) – Miért (nem) meritokratikusak a modern társadalmak? Századvég, 7. évf., 23. sz.; pp.3 - 31
91. Róbert P. (2004) – Iskolai teljesítmény és társadalmi háttér nemzetközi összehasonlításban; in: Társadalmi riport 2004, Kolosi T., Tóth I. Gy., Vukovich Gy. (szerk.); TÁRKI, Budapest, pp. 193–205.
92. Rojewski, J. W. (1996/1) – Educational and Occupational Aspiration of High School Seniors with Learning Disabilities; Exeptional Children, Vol. 62. No. 5, pp.463-476
93. Rojewski, J. W. (1996/2) - Occupational Aspirations and Early Career-Choice Patterns of Adolescents with and without Learning Disabilities; in: Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 99-116
94. Roth M., Damean D., Bowen G., Haragus T. P. (2010) – Cross National Use of Evaluation Technology. The School Success Profile; in: ICERI2010 Proceedings (3rd. International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation); pp. 2011-2020
95. Sajtos L., Mitev A. (é.n.) – SPSS kutatási és adatelemzési kézikönyv; Alinea Kiadó, Budapest
96. Sarkady K., Zsoldos M. (1992/93) – Koncepcionális kérdések a tanulási zavar fogalom körül; in: Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle, 48-49. évf., 1.-2. sz. pp. 259-269
97. Schultz, T. W. (1983) – Beruházás az emberi tőkébe; Közgazdasági és Jogi Kvk., Budapest
98. Scruggz T. E., Mastropieri M. A. (2002) – On Babies and Bathwater: Addressing the Problems of Identification of Learning Disabilities; in: Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 155-168
99. Shifrer D., Callahan R. M., Muller Ch. (2011) - Disproportionality and Learning Disabilities: Parsing Apart Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Language; in: Journal of Learning Disabilities 44 (3) pp. 246–257
100. Shifrer D. (2013/1) – Stigma of a Label: Educational Expectations for High School Students Labeled with Learning Disabilities; Journal of Health and Social Behavior 54(4) pp. 462 – 480
101. Shifrer D., Callahan R. M., Muller Ch. (2013/2) – Equity or Marginalization?The High-School Course-Taking of Students Labeled With a Learning Disability; in: American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 656-682

102. Slee, R. (1997) – Imported or important theory? Sociological Interrogations of Disablement and Special Education; British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18 (3), pp. 407–419.
103. Sleeter, Ch. (1987) Why Is There Learning Disabilities? A Critical Analysis of the Birth of the Field in Its Social Context, Disabilities Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 2, 2010
104. Szabó Á. (1998) – Szegénység és iskola – Kor- és kórkép a tanulásban akadályozott népesség iskoláztatásáról; 2. kiadás; Trezor Kiadó, Budapest
105. Szabó Á (2014) - Esélyek és egyenlőtlenségek. Gondolatok a tanulásban akadályozott személyek iskolai és társadalmi integrációjának összefüggéseiről; in: Gyógypedagógiai Szemle, 42. évf. 1. sz., pp. 1 – 8.
106. Szanyi-F. E. (2015) – Szakiskolás tanulók rövid távú munkaerő-piaci és továbbtanulási tervei, Doktori értekezés, Corvinus Egyetem, Budapest
107. Szemelvények a tanulási zavarok köréből, szerk. Torda Á. (é.n.), Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest
108. Szilágyi K. (2000) – Munka-pályatanácsadás mint professzió, Kollégium kft., Budapest
109. Torda Á. (2007) – Jövőnk, jelenünk tükrében. Gyógypedagógiai Szemle, 35. évf. 1. sz., pp. 27-34.
110. Torda Á. (2010) – Hátránykompenzálást támogató pedagógiai innováció; in: XIII. Apáczai Napok Nemzetközi Tudományos Konferencia Tanulmánykötete; Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem, Apáczai Csere János Kar, Győr, pp. 31 - 35
111. Varga A. (2015) – Az inklúzió szemlélete és gyakorlata; Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Neveléstudományi Intézet, Romológia és Nevelésszociológia Tanszék, Wislocki Henrik Szakkollégium, Pécs
112. Vargha A. (2005) – Mi történik, mit tegyünk, ha változónk nem normális eloszlású? Számítógépes statisztikai elemzések, ordinális csoport összehasonlító modellek; Doktori értekezés, ELTE, Budapest
113. Veres V. – Papp Z. A. (2015) - A szakválasztás és az iskolai kompetenciák társadalmi háttere és motivációi, nemzetiség szerint, a kolozsvári tudományegyetemek diákjai körében; Erdélyi Társadalom – 13. évf. 2. sz. pp. 35 – 64.
114. Vida G. (2015): A tanulási zavarok hazai kategorizálásnak problémái. Autonómia és Felelősség: Neveléstudományi Folyóirat, 3. évf. 3. sz., pp. 33-51

115. Vida G. (2017) – Miként lesz a tanulási zavar diagnózisa stigma – Avagy mi a fontosabb: a diagnózis vagy a gyermek?; Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 67. évf. 3-4. sz. pp. 16-33
116. Wendell S. (2009) – Az elutasított test – Feminista filozófiai értekezés a fogyatékosságról; in: Fogyatékosság és Társadalom; 1. évf. 1. sz. pp. 57-78
117. WHO (2001) - A funkcióképesség, a fogyatékosság és az egészség nemzetközi osztályozása (FNO); http://mek.oszk.hu/09700/09756/09756.pdf (utolsó letöltés: 2016. október 18.)
118. Zentall S. S., Beike S. M. (2012) – Achievement of Social Goals of Younger and Older Elementary Students: Response to Academic and Social Failure; Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 1. pp. 39-53
119. Zsoldos M. (szerk.) (2006) – (Gyógy)pedagógiai diagnosztika és tanácsadás – Kézikönyv a nevelési tanácsadókban, szakértői és rehabilitációs bizottságokban végzett komplex vizsgálathoz; Oktatási Minisztérium, Budapest